

Oxford Democrat.

VOLUME 5.

PARIS, MAINE, TUESDAY, MAY 15, 1838.

NUMBER 39.

OXFORD DEMOCRAT,
IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY TUESDAY BY
G. W. MILLETT.
TERMS—One dollar and fifty cents in advance
One dollar & seventy-five cents at the end of six months.
Two dollars at the end of the year.
No paper discontinued till all dues are paid, but at
the option of the publisher.
ADVERTISEMENTS inserted on the usual terms,
the proprietor not being accountable for any error in
any advertisement beyond the amount charged for it.
Communications, and letters on business must be
addressed to the publisher, Post-paid.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF INVESTIGATION—continued.

The rifle was procured by Mr. Jones, and sent by him to Mr. Wise, in accordance with a previous request of Mr. Wise, or in consequence of a conversation between them. Mr. Jones says it was in strict accordance with the request of Mr. Wise; and Mr. Wise says he had a conversation with Mr. Jones upon the subject, requested Mr. Jones to inform him where one could be obtained, and has no doubt that it was in consequence of this conversation that Mr. Jones sent the rifle, and that he acted with the best motive in sending it.

Mr. Wise having received the last note, called on Mr. Jones, and informed him that Mr. Graves had procured another rifle, and would be ready for the meeting, at 3 o'clock, P. M. The parties met by arrangement on the road to Marlborough, in Maryland. Mr. Cilley was accompanied by his second, Mr. Jones, by Mr. Bynum of North Carolina, and Col. James W. Schauburg, as his friends, and by Dr. Duncan of Ohio, as his surgeon. Mr. Graves was attended by Mr. Wise, as his second, by Mr. Crittenden, Senator from Kentucky, and Mr. Menefee of Kentucky, as his friends, and by Dr. Foltz, of this city, as his surgeon; and all proceeded thence about 2 o'clock P. M. to the place of meeting. Mr. Jones and Mr. Wise immediately marked off the ground. The line of fire was at right angles with the rays of the sun. The choice of positions fell by lot to Mr. Wise, and Mr. Jones had the giving of the word. Mr. Wise chose the position at the northwesterly end of the line. The distance was about ninety-two yards. There was a strong wind falling on the line of fire, at an angle of about 45° against Mr. Cilley. The position of Mr. Graves was near a wood, partly sheltered by it, and that of Mr. Cilley was on higher ground, and in the open field. The calibre of Mr. Graves's rifle was nearly twice as large as that of Mr. Cilley's, and would receive a ball of about eighty to the pound; while the rifle of Mr. Cilley would receive a ball of about one hundred and thirty-two to the pound. Mr. Calhoun and Mr. Hawes, both members of the House from Kentucky, were at some distance off as spectators. Mr. Wise had two rifles on the ground, one of which, not being loaded, remained, by consent, in one of the carriages. The back drivers were on the ground; and two other persons, (Grafton Powell and James F. Brown,) were present, without the consent of either party or their friends. Shortly after 3 o'clock, P. M. the parties exchanged shots, according to the terms of meeting. Mr. Cilley fired first, before he had fully elevated his piece; and Mr. Graves fired one or two seconds afterwards. Both missed. Mr. Graves could not have reserved his fire, had he been disposed to do so.

The friends assembled at the request of Mr. Wise, and Mr. Jones inquired of Mr. Wise whether his friend [Mr. Graves] was satisfied? Mr. Wise immediately said, "Mr. Jones, these gentlemen have come here without animosity towards each other; they are fighting merely upon a point of honor; cannot Mr. Cilley assign some reason for not receiving at Mr. Graves's hands Col. Webb's communication, or make some disclaimer which will relieve Mr. Graves from his position?" Mr. Jones replied: "While the challenge is impending, Mr. Cilley can make no explanations." Mr. Wise said: "The exchange of shots suspends the challenge, and the challenge is suspended for explanation." Mr. Jones, thereupon, went to Mr. Cilley and returned; and after a few words in regard to putting in writing what had been and might be said, Mr. Jones proceeded to say: "I am authorized by my friend, Mr. Cilley, to say, that in declining to receive the note from Mr. Graves, purporting to be from Colonel Webb, he meant no disrespect to Mr. Graves, because he entertained for him then, as he now does, the highest respect and the most kind feelings; but that he declined to receive the note, because he chose not to be drawn into any controversy with Colonel Webb," or, "he refuses to disclaim disrespect for Colonel Webb, because he does not choose to be drawn into an expression of opinion as to him." Both expressions were used in the course of the conversation. After a consultation on each side, Mr. Wise said to Mr. Jones, "This answer leaves Mr. Graves precisely in the position in which he stood when the challenge was sent." From an examination of the evidence, it will be perceived that, although the language made use of by the persons present, in narrating what passed on this occasion, is not the same, there is yet no substantial difference between them. Mr. Cilley re-asserted the ground which he had assumed in the correspondence; that he declined to receive the note of Webb, because he chose not to be drawn into no controversy with

him; that he refused to disclaim any personal exception to Webb as a gentleman or a man of honor, because he would neither affirm nor deny any thing in regard to his character; and that in declining to receive the demand of explanation, he had intended no disrespect to Mr. Graves. Mr. Cilley even went farther, and declared that he entertained for him the highest respect and the most kind feelings. The position of Graves was, therefore, not changed, except so far as the peril of life by Mr. Cilley in defence of his own position, and the subsequent voluntary avowal of the highest respect and the most kind feelings for the individual who had put him in jeopardy, may be supposed to have changed it.

Mr. Crittenden says, that it was now "urged on the part of Mr. Graves that Mr. Cilley ought to make some such explanation or declaration as had been proposed, for the satisfaction of Mr. Graves; while on the part of Mr. Cilley it was urged that Mr. Graves ought to be satisfied with the exchange of shots, without any such explanation or declaration." All the friends of Mr. Cilley urged that Mr. Graves should now be satisfied, and that the affair should now terminate, without requiring from Mr. Cilley any further concession beyond what he had already made. Doctor Foltz said he "thought the affair should end here; that there was no personal ill feelings between the parties; that they had both proved themselves men of honor and courage; and that Mr. Cilley's opinion, of Col. Webb could not be changed by the further exchange of shots or the receipt of wounds." Mr. Crittenden was understood, by nearly all present, to concur in these views, though it seems he did not intend so to be understood, but acquiesced with Mr. Wise and Mr. Menefee in insisting that the fight should go on, unless Mr. Cilley would make the concession which had been demanded. Accordingly the challenge was renewed, the parties resumed their positions, and again exchanged shots in the manner prescribed by the terms of meeting. Mr. Graves fired first, before he had fully elevated his piece; Mr. Cilley fired about two seconds afterwards. They both missed. Mr. Cilley could not have reserved his fire had he been disposed to do so. Mr. Jones, Mr. Bynum, Mr. Schauburg, Doctor Foltz, Mr. Wise, and Mr. Fuller, thought, from the motions and appearance of Mr. Graves, that he was hit. He at once said, "I must have another shot." Mr. Wise says, "he positively, peremptorily, and repeatedly insisted upon another shot."

The seconds and friends again assembled, and the challenge was again withdrawn. Mr. Jones said, "Mr. Wise, my friend, in coming to the ground and exchanging shots with Mr. Graves, has shown to the world that, in declining to receive the note of Colonel Webb, he did not do so because he dreaded a controversy. He has shown himself a brave man, and disposed to render satisfaction to Mr. Graves. I do think that he has done so, and that the matter should end here." Mr. Wise replied, in substance: "Mr. Jones, Mr. Cilley has already expressed his respect for Mr. Graves, in the written correspondence, and Mr. Graves does not require of Mr. Cilley a certificate of character for Colonel Webb; he considers himself bound not only to preserve the respect due to himself, but to defend the honor of his friend, Colonel Webb. Mr. Graves only insists that he has not borne the note of a man who is not a man of honor and not a gentleman." The challenge was again renewed, and while the friends were loading the rifles, Mr. Wise and Mr. Jones walked apart, and Mr. Wise asked Mr. Jones: "If Mr. Cilley could assign the reason for declining to receive the note of Col. Webb, that he [Mr. Cilley] did not hold himself accountable to Colonel Webb for words spoken in debate?" Mr. Jones replied, that "Mr. Cilley would not assign that reason, because he did not wish to be understood as expressing the opinion whether he was or was not accountable for words spoken in debate." Mr. Wise then asked Mr. Jones whether "Mr. Cilley would not say that, in declining to receive the note of Colonel Webb, he meant no disrespect to Mr. Graves, either directly or indirectly?" To which Mr. Jones replied affirmatively, adding, "Mr. Cilley entertains the highest respect for Mr. Graves, but declined to receive the note because he chose to be drawn into no controversy with Colonel Webb." Mr. Jones says that Mr. Wise took no exception to this answer, but continued to require other concessions, as stated to be made. Mr. Wise says that in making that proposition he went beyond his instructions; and that the proposition and response to it were not communicated to Mr. Graves, but were communicated both to Mr. Graves and to Mr. Menefee. Mr. Crittenden says he does not remember to have heard them, nor to have heard of them, during the progress of the contest, and that he does not remember to have given any advice or opinion upon them. Mr. Menefee remembers the proposition and reply, and positively or by acquiescence gave the advice that the reply, thus qualified, was but a reiteration, in substance, of the original ground assumed by Mr. Cilley, and held to be inadmissible by Mr. Graves. Mr. Wise had, in his possession, on the ground, three written propositions, neither of which was exhibited, nor their substance

submitted, in any other manner than as before stated.

Mr. Jones, Mr. Bynum, Mr. Schauburg, Dr. Duncan, and Dr. Foltz, now objected, in the strongest language, against the further prosecution of the contest, and insisted that he should declare himself satisfied. Mr. Crittenden was understood again, by nearly all present, to concur in these views; but it appears from his testimony, that he acquiesced in the views of Mr. Wise and Mr. Menefee. They insisted that the fight should go on, unless Mr. Cilley would make the concessions which were demanded; either a direct disclaimer of any personal exception to James Watson Webb, as a gentleman and a man of honor, in declining to receive his note, or an indirect disclaimer, by placing the refusal to receive it upon the ground of privilege; both of which Mr. Cilley, in the correspondence and throughout the affair upon the field, had refused to do, and, persisting in it had twice received the fire of his antagonist.

Immediately previous to the last exchange of shots, Mr. Wise said to Mr. Jones, "If this matter is not terminated this shot, and is not settled, I will propose to shorten the distance." To which Mr. Jones replied, "After this shot, without effect, I will entertain the proposition." Mr. Graves had directed Mr. Wise, if they missed repeatedly, to prevent a prolongation of the affair by proposing closer quarters; in consequence of which, Mr. Wise made the proposition, which would have aggravated the severity of the terms. The rifles being loaded, the parties resumed their stations, and fired the third time very nearly together. Mr. Cilley was shot through the body. He dropped his rifle, beckoned to one near him, and said to him, "I am shot," put both hands to his wound, fell, and in two or three minutes expired.

Early in the day on which he fell, an agreement was entered into between James Watson Webb, Daniel Jackson, and William H. Morell, to arm themselves, repair to the room of Mr. Cilley, and force him to fight Webb with pistols on the spot, or to pledge his word of honor to give Webb a meeting before Mr. Graves and, if Mr. Cilley would do neither, to shatter his right arm. They accordingly took measures to ascertain whether Mr. Cilley was at his lodgings; and finding that he was not, they proceeded, well armed, to Bladensburg, where it was said the duel between Mr. Graves and Mr. Cilley was to take place. Before arriving there, it was agreed between Webb, Jackson, and Morell, that Webb should approach Mr. Cilley, claim the quarrel, insist on fighting him, and assure him that if he aimed his rifle at Mr. Graves, he [Webb] would shoot him [Cilley] on the spot. It was supposed by them that Mr. Graves or Mr. Wise, or some of the party, would raise a weapon at Webb, whereupon it was agreed that Webb should instantly shoot Mr. Cilley, and that they should then defend themselves in the best way they could. Not finding the parties at the old Magazine, and thence to the shore of the Potomac, near the arsenal, at Greenleaf's Point, whence, it being after 3 o'clock, P. M. they returned to the city, to await the result. "It is unnecessary to add," say they, in a statement drawn up by Webb, signed by Jackson and Morell, and published in the New York Courier and Enquirer, "what would have been the course of Col. Webb, if Mr. Graves, instead of Mr. Cilley, had been injured. Suffice it to say, that it was sanctioned by us; and however much we deplored it, we could not doubt but the extraordinary position in which he would have been placed would have warranted the course determined upon." It is difficult to imagine what is here darkly shadowed forth, if it be not that had Mr. Cilley survived the encounter with Mr. Graves, and had the latter suffered in it, it would then have been the fate of Mr. Cilley to have encountered an assassin.

Such were the material facts and circumstances which attended the death of Mr. Cilley. The committee, entertaining the opinion that the cause of the challenge was the cause of the death of Mr. Cilley, have sought for it where it should be found in the most authentic form, in the correspondence of the parties.

Mr. Cilley declined to receive the note of Mr. Webb, because he "chose to be drawn into no controversy with him." He placed his refusal to receive a demand for explanation of the words spoken by him in debate solely on the ground of his own voluntary election, without assigning any other reason. "He chose to be drawn into no controversy" with Webb. He declared, at the same time, that he neither affirmed nor denied any thing in regard to Webb's character, in declining to receive the note. He declared further, that he had before stated, and now repeated, that he intended by the refusal no disrespect to Mr. Graves, and that he had said this only in reply to a remark of Mr. Graves, that this course might place him in an unpleasant situation.

Mr. Graves in his second note takes but one exception to the first note of Mr. Cilley. "It does not decline any exception to him (Webb) personally as a gentleman." He says, "Your note of yesterday, in reply to mine of that date, is inexplicit, unsatisfactory, and insufficient; among other things in this—that, in your declin-

ing to receive Colonel Webb's communication, it does not disclaim any exception to him personally, as a gentleman." "I have, therefore," he adds, "to inquire whether you declined to receive his communication on the ground of any personal exception to him as a gentleman or a man of honor? A categorical answer is expected."

Mr. Cilley, in his second note, regrets that his first was unsatisfactory, but cannot admit the right of Mr. Graves to propound the question, and, therefore, he declines any further response to it.

It is difficult to conceive the Mr. Graves, upon this correspondence of Mr. Cilley, could have challenged him for intended disrespect to Mr. Webb; for any such intention was positively disclaimed, and, as appears, in a most unexceptionable and courteous manner, in reply to a suggestion of his own, which called for it; or for affirming or denying in regard to the character of Webb, in declining to receive his note; for any such affirmation or denial is also disclaimed in equally positive terms. Mr. Cilley had declined to receive a call from James Watson Webb, for explanation of words spoken in debate in the House of Representatives, and had put his refusal solely on the ground that he chose to be drawn into no controversy with him; but he is pressed further, and interrogated beyond this limit, which he had assigned to himself, and a categorical answer is demanded to the question whether he declined on the ground of any personal exception to Webb as a gentleman or a man of honor. He denies the right to interrogate him in this manner for declining a call, which his right, and duty, as a member of the House of Representatives, and the just maintenance of the privileges of that body, required him to decline; and, denying the right to interrogate, he therefore, refused to submit to answer any further. And it was because he refused to receive the note, and refused to answer any further, that he was challenged by another member of the same body.

This matter is not left open to inference or argument. The cause of the challenge appears in a manner which precludes all doubt. It is still further specified and avowed by Mr. Graves himself, in his own note, which contains the challenge. It is stated clearly, unequivocally, and with the utmost precision, and is assigned expressly, and in the form, as the cause for which the challenge is given. "As you have declined accepting a communication which I bore to you from Colonel Webb, and as your note of yesterday you have refused to decline on the ground which would exonerate me from all responsibility growing out of the affair, I am left no other alternative but to ask that satisfaction which is recognized among gentlemen." Mr. Cilley, by his "note of yesterday," had refused to answer the question to which a "categorical answer" has been demanded: that is to say, "whether he declined to receive Colonel Webb's communication on the ground of any personal exception to him as a gentleman or a man of honor." The ground of challenge, therefore, is, by Mr. Graves himself, expressly stated to be, that Mr. Cilley declined to receive the communication from Webb, and by his note of February 22d, refused to answer that question, touching the honor of Webb. This was the open and avowed cause, set forth and presented to Mr. Cilley, by which he was guided, and upon which he acted, in a manner involving the utmost extremity of human responsibility. For this cause, and for this alone, he was challenged and fell by the hand of Mr. Graves; unless it be admissible to believe that, after all verbal communication had caused between him and his antagonist, and the difference had assumed the form exclusively of a written correspondence between them, he was challenged and fell for a cause not set up in that correspondence, not put forth as a ground of complaint, not made known to him or his friends as a matter of grievance, and in regard to which, therefore, it may be believed, he was profoundly ignorant, and no opportunity afforded him in any way of voluntary satisfaction or explanation.

Nor is there anything in what subsequently occurred, as disclosed by the joint statement of the seconds, or the testimony of any witness, which gives color to a suggestion, that there was at any time afterwards, a change of the ground of controversy.

No communication whether, upon the subject of difference, took place between the principals, their respective seconds, or friends, after the challenge was given, before the first exchange of shots. Of course, no change of the ground of controversy could have occurred until after Mr. Cilley had received the fire of his antagonist, and had hazarded his life in defence of the position which he had assumed in the correspondence. After the first exchange of shots, as already shown, Mr. Cilley re-asserted his original position, and Mr. Jones insisted that what was then said by Mr. Jones only placed "the affair upon the original grounds," and left "Mr. Graves precisely in the position in which he stood when the challenge was sent." There was, in fact, no change whatever in the position of the parties, except what arose from the circumstance Mr. Cilley had given Mr. Graves the satisfaction demanded of an exchange of shots, and from the fur-

ther circumstance that Mr. Cilley not only repeated the disclaimer that he had meant no disrespect to Mr. Graves, but positively avowed, also, that he entertained for him the highest respect and the most kind feelings.

In this state of the controversy, the challenge is renewed, and Mr. Cilley again puts his life in jeopardy. The challenge being once more suspended he again insists upon his original position, that he had declined to receive the demand for explanation of the words spoken by him in debate, because he chose to be drawn into no controversy with Webb, and that he would assign no other reason; and while on the other hand, it was insisted for Mr. Graves that he considered himself bound not only to preserve the respect due to himself but to defend the honor of his friend, Col. Webb; and that he only insisted "that he had not borne the note of a man who was not a man of honor and not a gentleman." Mr. Cilley replied affirmatively to a proposition submitted on the part of Mr. Graves, that in declining to receive the note, he meant no disrespect to Mr. Graves, either directly or indirectly; and declared that he entertained the highest respect for him, but declined to receive the note, because he chose to be drawn into no controversy with Col. Webb. He excluded, in direct and positive terms, every possibility of disrespect to Mr. Graves, directly, or indirectly; and in effect only insisted on his right to decline a demand for explanation of words spoken in debate, because he chose to be drawn into no controversy upon the subject, without assigning any other reason. But he was interrogated for another reason, and another reason was demanded; and for resisting that demand the challenge was again renewed, and he fell a victim in defence of what he conceived to be his rights as an individual, or as a representative of the people in the House of Representatives.

The committee were disposed to pursue the inquiry in every form. Not content with tracing the cause of the challenge in the written correspondence, in the assignment of reasons for the challenge under Mr. Graves's own hand, and in the various propositions which were submitted on the field, from the beginning to the end of the contest, they proceeded to put in every witness who was believed to know anything upon the subject, the direct inquiry, whether "Mr. Graves or his second, at any time before Mr. Cilley fell, communicated to Mr. Cilley, his second, or attendant friends, that a question of veracity between Mr. Graves and Mr. Cilley was a point of difficulty to be adjusted?" Mr. Jones answered, "certainly not to me, nor to Mr. Cilley, at any time, to my knowledge, either before or during the day the duel was fought. I did not hear of the existence of such a question until the Sunday or Monday after Mr. Cilley was killed. The written correspondence between Mr. Graves and Mr. Cilley does not show the existence of any such question of veracity." Mr. Bynum answered, "I heard no such communication, directly or indirectly, from either Mr. Graves or his second, made or intimated, to Mr. Cilley or any of his friends, before he fell." Mr. Schauburg answered, "I did not understand that there was a question of veracity between the parties, nor was there any conversation on the subject."

Dr. Duncan answered, "They never did to my knowledge. I never heard the question of veracity assigned, during Mr. Cilley's life, as the cause of any difficulty." Mr. Pierce answered, "I never heard any conversation with Mr. Graves, or his second or attendant friends, in relation to the late duel, nor did I ever hear, until subsequently to the 24th of February last, that any question of veracity between Mr. Graves and Mr. Cilley was a point of difficulty to be adjusted." Dr. Foltz answered, "They did not." Mr. Wise answered, "I do not know what Mr. Graves may have communicated to Mr. Cilley at any time before he fell, as to a question of veracity between them. I presume they both knew what had passed between them, verbally. I believe I did state to Mr. Jones, or to other friends of Mr. Cilley, on the ground, that Mr. Graves said Mr. Cilley had assigned to him the reason for declining to receive the note of Col. Webb, that he did not choose to be held accountable for words spoken in debate. I think I so informed Mr. Jones when I asked him if Mr. Cilley could not assign this reason on the ground; but of this I am not positive."

Mr. Crittenden answered, "Not that I know of. I know of no communication between any of these parties other than as before stated, so far as I now recollect. Whether those communications involve any such question it is not for me to decide; no such question was made, in terms, that I know of." Mr. Menefee answered, "Mr. Graves had no communication of any kind with Mr. Cilley, his second, or attendant friends, and of course did not communicate to them that such a question was a point of difficulty. Nor did the second of Mr. Graves, as far as I remember, make such a communication, except so far as may be implied from his propositions made by him, in connection with the correspondence, &c. One, at least, of the friends of Mr. Graves, in the presence of his second, made frequent attempts to direct the attention of the second and friends of Mr. Cilley to the difficulty which was presented by the terms of Mr. Graves's first note (giving his ver-

sion of what Mr Cilley had said) and the ground which Mr Cilley had subsequently assumed. But it was not referred to, in terms, as a question of veracity. It was believed that Mr Cilley had honorable grounds, which would be satisfactory to Mr Graves, and at the same time compatible with truth, which would effect the object, without making directly such a question, whilst efforts were pending to accommodate. Whether the views, thus expressed, were communicated to Mr Cilley, I know not. For the character of what occurred on this point, so far as I participated in it, the committee are referred to my general statement."

Mr Graves said to Dr Foltz, on the way to the field, "That he had been the bearer of a note from Col. Webb to Mr Cilley, inquiring if Mr Cilley had been correctly reported in the Globe. Mr Cilley refused to receive the note, and declined giving his reasons, which implicated me, in consequence of which I challenged him, but I have no personal animosity towards him." Mr Wise said on the field, "Mr Jones, these gentlemen have come here without animosity towards each other; they are fighting merely upon a point of honor." "These men have nothing against each other; they are merely settling a point of honor."

This concurrent testimony of all, without exception, taken in connection with the written correspondence, the various propositions and answers on the field, and the further fact that Mr Cilley had not been informed that Mr Graves had undertaken to repeat to others any verbal communication between them, or that any misapprehension or misunderstanding existed between them on that subject, utterly repels the suggestion, that any question of veracity had arisen, or had been made, or was the cause of the challenge, or of the death of Mr Cilley. Indeed, any misapprehension on that subject would have given no more just ground of animosity, and, least of all, of the highly vindictive feeling necessarily aroused by a question of veracity, than the very evident misapprehension which Mr Graves labored under in regard to some parts of the note of James Watson Webb, of which he was the bearer.

The committee will not, in justice to Mr Graves, harbor the belief, that there were rankling secretly in his bosom any vindictive or hostile feelings towards Mr Cilley, growing out of any question of personal veracity, and prompting him to carry on a deadly warfare under another pretext, not only with a direct and explicit disclosure of the real cause of difficulty, such as would have left no misapprehension on the mind of any one, but under circumstances which misled the other party and his friends, and left him, under the false impression, to the fore of his life.

[The remainder was published on the first page of our last week's paper.]

BUSINESS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

"The House of Representatives is still involved in the mere technicalities, which are drawn like spider-webs around the report of the committee on the fatal attack on the privileges of the House. The effort of the opposition seems to be to get rid of the report and the subject, by what the lawyers call *demurring*. They wish to evade the expression of an opinion upon the merits of the case as brought up by the report. The facts it embodies, the principle it lays down, and the deductions which it draws from both, are all thrown out of the question—and the whole discussion made to turn upon some cavil as to the rules, by which it is proposed to set aside the order of the House referring the subject for a report from the committee, or to set aside the report itself, by referring it back to the committee, with orders to strike out the report, and in this way get rid of voting on the plain facts and incontestible conclusions of the obnoxious paper.

But it appears that the opposition are not satisfied with the suppressing the plain, simple, unvarnished state of the case, as summed up by the majority of the committee, and all action on its recommendation. They are incensed that the public should even know what it is that forms the subject of discussion. The rule of the House requires that when any report is made the subject of discussion on which members are to vote, any member has a right to insist on the reading of it. The first endeavor of the opposition was to prevent the reading, but Mr. Boon enforced the rule, and the paper was publicly read. Since then it has been from day to day publicly discussed; yet from day to day we are abused in the House to reporting that paper to the country, in regard to which we report daily its debates. It is insisted that we have committed a breach of the privileges of the House, in publishing a public document, in connection with which we report their daily proceedings. If we understand anything of the principles of our Government, the moment any thing is made public in the House of Representatives of the people, it is accessible to the people themselves. If the House does not close its doors, the whole business upon which it acts is supposed to be in the face of the country; and even if the House refuse to print a paper made the subject of its public debates, it never was heretofore considered as excluding it from the public journals. How is it with the Abolition petitions? The House has refused to read, print or discuss them; and yet we doubt whether Mr Adams himself would say that it is a breach of the privileges to lay them before the country in the columns of a newspaper. It has been done again and again, and yet there never has been the slightest suggestion that there was any thing wrong in this.

The suggestion that a single copy of the report was obtained from the Globe office before

its delivery in the House, (except under the order of the committee,) is utterly false. The editor himself never even read a word of its contents.—Globe.

DEMOCRATIC STATE CONVENTION.

Paris, May 15, 1838.

Democratic State Convention.

In compliance with the direction of the Convention of the Democratic Members of the Legislature, held in Augusta in March last, a State Convention of Democratic Delegates will be held at the State House, in Augusta, on WEDNESDAY, the TWENTIETH DAY OF JUNE NEXT, at 11 o'clock, A. M., to nominate a candidate to be supported for Governor at the next ensuing election.

Each classed town and organized plantation is requested to send one Delegate to said Convention; and each town and city two Delegates for every Representative to which they are entitled in the State Legislature.

By order of the State Committee.

April 13, 1838.

Particular Notice.

The Subscribers to the Democrat who are in arrears for one year or more are respectfully requested to settle the same speedily. All indebted for Advertising or Job Work will oblige the subscriber by paying up immediately. G. W. MILLETT.

April 10, 1838.

We conclude in this number of our paper, the publication of the report of the majority of the Committee appointed to investigate the circumstances of the duel which resulted in the death of Mr. Cilley. We invite the attention of our readers to it, as they will find there sufficient reasons why the federalists are so anxious to suppress its publication. As a party they feel bound to sustain Messrs. Wise and Graves against the torrent of public indignation which this transaction has directed towards them, and this can be done only by suppressing the facts in the case. So far as party considerations are concerned we care little what may be the decision of Congress on this subject. Public opinion cannot be controlled or stifled. For the honor of our common country we could desire to see our national representatives reflect the public feeling and embody the indignation that all honorable and virtuous men must feel towards the actors in this bloody tragedy. If Congress dared to speak and act as they think regardless of party, we believe that the expulsion of Graves and Wise would be carried almost by acclamation. If however it is to be made entirely a party affair, let it be so understood and we are perfectly willing to abide that result. If the federalists think it advisable and take upon themselves the odium of justifying or defending that transaction, be it so. Let the people decide upon it in that way if they choose.—If they can derive any benefit from it (beyond the two votes they have gained by Mr. Cilley's death) or claim any merit from the transaction, at the bar of public opinion they are welcome to it. But they dare not trust the merits of the case even with the drilled and disciplined members of their party in the House. They dare not risk a vote, expressive of the sentiment of the members, relative to this affair, but they seek to stifle all expression of opinion, and to suppress all information obtained by a Committee raised expressly for that purpose. They dare not excuse the members implicated and they are unwilling to condemn them. Their object then is to evade any vote upon this report but to get rid of it by technical objections. If this course should be taken let the public mark those who vote for it. They either sanction the transaction or for party purposes would screen the parties concerned.

The Washington correspondent of the Portland Advertiser, has proved apparently to his own satisfaction that Mr. Webster was not opposed to the last war, nor belonged to the Hartford Convention School of politics. After taking breath from this effort, we would recommend that he make him out a democrat of the war times. He may perhaps get a certificate from Mr. Webster to that effect, and this with a few extracts from some old speech—detached sentences that by themselves mean anything or nothing, will be sufficient for the purpose. It is hardly worth while to attempt to whitewash the political character of so distinguished a man as Mr. Webster. If his federalism could be disproved, which we imagine no sensible man would attempt, we believe it would hardly raise him in the estimation of the party to which he at present belongs. He has been so long and so conspicuously before the public, that opinion is fixed as to his political character, and those members of the opposition who once claimed to be republicans will hardly be induced to forgive, what they once considered his heresies, though there is no diversity of opinion between them now. He must look for friends and support to his old associates, and it would be poor policy in him to desert them or forfeit their good opinion in the hope of thereby gaining new friends. Indeed his case is desperate and cause hopeless. He can never be the candidate of the party he is now associated with for the Presidential chair. Clay or some other more wily politician may use him as a tool to further his own designs but that is all he is to expect.

It is rumored that the reason why the Register of Probate in this County has not been removed, is that the federal party are so ashamed of the prominent candidates who claim this share of the spoil that they will not consent to the removal. This certainly is a very singular reason, when we take into consideration the appointments that have been made under the new dynasty. The claimants must be desperate indeed if that party have any scruples about their fitness. It is said that there has been some talk about importing a candidate, for the want of suitable materials in this County. This would be highly complimentary to the natives.

LOOK HERE UPON THIS PICTURE.

How true it is that Federalism never changes its principles—its distinguishing characteristics. Such as it was on the day when it first raised its hydra head and serpent form, so it is now, and so will it ever be until the genius of democracy shall have completely destroyed it. Names cannot conceal the true character of federalism, any more than they can change the properties of any thing else. The ass is still an ass although he may have clothed himself in the skin of the lion, and federalism is still federalism although it may have assumed the once honored name of Whig.

That ever watchful Apostle of Democracy, THOMAS JEFFERSON, knew full well the subtle

character of this dangerous enemy to the principles of perfect freedom, which he so nobly maintained. In a letter written by this distinguished patriot to Mr. Muezzi, dated April 24, 1796, we find the subjoined picture of federalism as it was at that period:—

"The aspect of politics has wonderfully changed since you left us. In place of that noble love of liberty and republican government which carried us triumphantly through the war, an Anglican monarchical and aristocratic party has sprung up, whose avowed object is to draw over us the substance, as they have already done the forms, of the British government. The main body of our citizens, however, remain true to their republican principles: the whole landed interest is republican, and so is a great mass of talents. Against us are the executive, the judiciary, two out of three branches of the legislature, all the officers of the government, all who want to be officers, all timid men who prefer the calm of despotism to the boisterous sea of liberty, British merchants, and Americans trading on British capitals, speculators and holders in the banks and public funds, a confederate invented for the purposes of corruption, and for assimilating us in all things to the rotten us well as the sound parts of the British model. It would give you a fever were I to name to you some of the apostates who have gone over to these heresies, men who were Samsons in the field and Solomons in the council, but who have had their heads shorn by the harlot England. In short we are likely to preserve the liberty we have obtained only by unremitting labor and perils. But we shall preserve it, and our mass of weight and wealth on the good side is so great, as to leave no danger that force will ever be attempted against us. We have only to awake and snap the Lilliputian cords with which they have been entangling us during the first sleep which succeeded our labors.

Such was federalism, in 1796, and it faithfully portrays the principles of Whiggery, in 1838. So exact is the similitude, were it not for the necessary allusion to certain events, we should certainly conclude that Mr. Jefferson was defining the prominent features of modern whiggism. True, the Government is now democratic, but all who want to be officers, all who are involved in the meshes of Bank despotism, British merchants, and Americans trading on British capital, speculators, &c. &c. are nearly all harnessed to the car of federalism, while the landed interest is now democratic as it was in 1796. With these facts before us, we cannot resist the conviction that federalism and whiggery are, to use the lauded expression of the *Magnus Apollo* of the party—Webster—now and forever, one and inseparable.

Satan Democrat.

From the Bangor Democrat.

SPECIE PAYMENTS.

We have read and we believe with every disposition to learn and to adopt the truth, the recent letter of Mr. Biddle upon the resumption of specie payments. Though we cannot assent to all his positions, and all his reasonings, we are fully of opinion that a resumption could not be permanent and healthy unless government will cease hostilities towards the banks. They need no aid—no encouragement. They only require to be let alone—for protected and fostered, they attain an unnatural growth and power—oppressed and straitened, they can have but a short life and ineffectual action. To enable them to resume specie payments, then, and safely to extend to the business community the relief they require, they only want an assurance that government will cease its warfare. But they must have something more than the recent ambiguous letter of the Secretary of the Treasury, while all the hostile measure of the *hard money* faction are so vigorously pushed in and out of Congress. They should not trust to promises, unstinted by corresponding conduct; for intentions are always more safely deduced from action, than from words.

[Republican.]

One would suppose from reading the above article that the Editor of the Eastern Republican was a warm advocate, instead of being a violent opponent of the Sub-Treasury Bill. That bill proposes to separate the affairs of the Government from the affairs of the Banks, or more correctly speaking, to perpetuate what has already taken place. By their suspension of specie payments, for the accommodation of themselves, or to avoid the necessity of pressing upon some less highly favored customers, whom they had accommodated beyond their means of payment, the Banks themselves cut the connection subsisting between them and the Government; their bills could no longer be received in payment, and they could no longer be made depositories of the revenue.—By the law of 1816, only the bills of specie paying banks could be received in payment of the public dues, and by the law of 1836, only specie paying banks could be made or continued depositories of the public moneys. The Banks then separated from the Government, not the Government from the Banks. The Sub-Treasury bill merely provides for the safe keeping of the public moneys in the present state of things, and secure the country from a recurrence of a similar disaster. The Banks contend that as they only separated from the Government when it suited their own convenience, they they also should be allowed to reunite at will; in other words that they shall or shall not be functionaries of the Government at their own pleasure. If corporations have no souls, Bank Corporations, it must be confessed, are not deficient in impudence.—But the Editor says, all they want is to be left alone; if the Sub-Treasury Bill should pass they will be gratified in this wish to its fullest extent—they

will be left alone in their glory.' The Editor, however, is confessedly no Bank Man, he is not let into the secret wishes of the Banks; or not having read the Sub-Treasury Bill, in the confiding simplicity of his heart he judges of it by the declamatory invectives of the Bank Lawyers at Washington. Many of the brawling Bank advocates after all may not be so bad as they are represented; weak but not wicked; in this censorious world, the errors of the heart and those of the head are not sufficiently distinguished. For the benefit of the Editor, for we would in charity rank him among the deceived and not among the "gay deceivers" who have received a service of plate, or an accommodation of \$52,000 in the way of a fair business transaction, or among the forty four honorable members of Congress who pocketed on an average two thousand eight hundred dollars, money loaned to them by the Bank of the U. S. in 1832, pending the application for a recharter, we will state what are the wishes of the Banks, the boon for which they are now contending.—The Banks want that the revenue of the country should be collected in their Bills, that those Bills when received should be deposited in their vaults, not for safe keeping, but to be reloaned to their customers. The exclusive privilege now enjoyed by the Banks, of issuing bills to circulate as money, is not sufficient to satisfy their rapacity, but they must have the money collected from the People, to meet the necessary expenditures of the Government, deposited in their vaults, to be used by them for their own benefit in such manner and for whatever purpose they may deem proper. If the world was made for man, one would suppose from their pretensions that they thought man was made for the Banks.

The Editor says the Banks will not be safe in resuming specie payments unless Government will suspend its hostilities; he disclaims the need of any help, he wants only a suspension of hostilities. A man of common understanding who was not a Bank man, would consider a perpetual noninter course, as not only a suspension but a cessation of hostilities. But what evidence has the Government ever given of any hostile feeling to the Banks, or does this assertion rest solely on the credit of the Bank Lawyers in Congress? It is true that the assertion has been made by them, but no specifications adduced, and not sustainable by reason, speeches of four days in length have been made in order to veil the poverty of the argument by the multiplication of words; but after the report of Mr. Tyler of the Senate in 1834, we have reasonable ground for suspicion, that Members of Congress may be operated upon by other inducements than those arising from considerations of public interest. The question is reiterated what evidence has the Government given of hostility to the Banks? Was the indulgence of time extended to the Banks to enable them to refund the money deposited in their vaults, a proof of hostility? Was the reception of their Bills in payment of Bonds to the Custom House, until the very day of the suspension of specie payments, when their bills could not have been received but in flagrant violation of the law of 1816—a proof of hostility? Was the extension granted to Merchants on their hands to the Custom House, thereby increasing their ability to meet their obligations to the Banks, a proof of hostility? Was the issue of ten millions of Treasury Notes, receivable in all dues to the Government, and so far performing the office, and lessening the demand for specie, a proof of hostility? If these are evidences of hostility, then may the Government be hostile to the Banks, but if they are not, then the Editor is asked what evidence he can adduce in support of his assertion; specifications, not round assertions are demanded.

"In 1824, the panic session, a majority of the Senate being in favor of the Bank, instructed the Committee on Finance, which was also favorable, "to investigate the affairs and conduct of that institution," and that committee made through Mr. Tyler a Report furnished by the Bank itself.—Extract of a Speech of Mr. Allen of Ohio, in the Senate of the United S. on the Independent Treasury Bill.

Mr. Allen then made a statement from the above named report, of the aggregate of loans to a specified number of members of Congress from 1830 to 1834 inclusive; which statement, thrown into a tabular form, is subjoined for the information of those who are disposed to analyze the motives of men. Any comment upon these facts would be superfluous—the bare knowledge of them is sufficient to explain that devotion of certain members of Congress to the Bank of the United States, which would be otherwise unaccountable. The price of members of Congress in those years fluctuated as much as that of bucks in the years of merino mania. Well might Noah of the Courier and Enquirer say that the Bank bought up men as it would cattle in the market.

Table of Loans to members of Congress by the U. S. Bank from 1830 to 1834, giving the number of members accommodated, the aggregate of the Loans in each year, and the average to each member. Bangor Democrat.

Year.	No. members.	Aggregate loan.	Average.
1830	52	\$192,161	\$3,694
1831	50	32,219	5,460
1832	44	478,069	10,860
1833	58	374,796	6,461
1834	52	238,586	4,588

From the Age of last week we take the following just remarks respecting the Convention.

"The fact that the democratic party throughout the State is now united to an extent rarely before witnessed, should not have the effect to render our friends indifferent to the duty de-

voted upon them by the call. The convention should be fully attended from every section of the State. The gathering of the Democracy, on that occasion, should correspond to the importance of the crisis, the power of the party, and the magnitude of the victory to be won, in the campaign then to be opened. Our opponents flushed with their accidental success at the late election, possessed of the appointing power and of the public chest, having at their command for the establishment of presses and the circulation of lies, funds furnished from another State have determined to make a desperate trial of the power of money and falsehood over the politics of Maine. The State has been promised to Mr Biddle and his combination of broken banks, and none of the appliances upon which that distinguished financier is accustomed to rely, will be wanting to fulfil the promise.

In this state of things, it behooves the Democracy to be on the alert. Eternal vigilance is the price of democratic liberty. Let the democratic party, by their delegates, assemble in convention, to select their candidate—harmonize their efforts banish the treacherous from the camp—consult upon the importance of the struggle—weigh well the difficulties to be encountered—settle upon the best means of overcoming falsehood with truth—drive federalism from our borders back to its ancient domain—pull down from the capital its disgraceful five-striped flag, and hoist in its place the star-spangled banner of democracy. The sisterhood of Democratic State expects Maine to do her duty, and to preserve unbroken that glorious platoon which has stood proud and firm and triumphant, in the storm as well as in the sunshine, against the assaults of federalism."

A Bank-bought paper, on the authority of a correspondent, charges a member of Congress with offering to sell his influence for a share in a patent right. Henry A. Wise of Virginia, under pretence that the reputation of Congress was implicated, by this charge upon the purity of an unknown member, moves the appointment of a committee of investigation. Miserable fire! for resisting which the life of Jonathan Cilley was sacrificed. Mr Allen of Ohio in the Senate of the United States, charges members of Congress of having received from the U. S. Bank from the year 1830 to 1834, the five years of Bank war from the revenues of the country, \$1,605,781! he charges 44 members of Congress of having received in the year 1832, the recharter of the Bank then pending, \$478,069! on an average to each member 10,860! A death like silence is preserved—not a word is said to clear the outraged honor of the national legislature! Is the sore too rotten to be probed? The names of those 44 members have been suppressed: concealment indicates guilt! The patronage of office has been suffered in silence, to be harped upon too long; too long the direct, the overbearing influence, exercised by a moneyed corporation has been suffered to pass unimpeded; democrats relying on the soundness of their arguments have not deemed to defend their own motives, or impugn those of their opponents.—The days of forbearance have passed—it has now ceased to be a virtue! Bribery and Corruption have stalked through our land unheeded the bulls of legislation have been polluted; Representatives have betrayed the interest of their Constituents, and the malefactors have not been exposed; the holy cause of liberty is in danger; the gangrene must be cut or death must ensue! Public Virtue is the presiding genius of a Republic. Public Virtue and Corruption cannot exist together—one or the other must prevail. A crisis has arrived in the affairs of our country. If the banks, through the agency of their hirelings in Congress prevail in the contest now raging, farewell, but not forever, to Liberty. She will be again restored to us, will be again welcomed, although bathed in blood, after passing through the horrors of a REVOLUTION.—Bangor Democrat.

PAYMENTS IN SPECIE.

The Opposition are consistent only in committing inconsistencies. They complain that the public officers are paid in specie, and have a different currency from the people, and at the same time charge the Government with being bankrupt, and, if paying debts at all, that it pays, as Mr Webster says, only in Treasury notes, at a discount every where below the rag paper of banks. Which is true? Neither.

A document, published by the House of Representatives at this session, shows what claims have been paid in specie during the year, and no Executive officer on a salary here appears to have received a draft for a dollar in specie. On the contrary, it seems to have been paid chiefly to contractors, laborers, pensioners, merchants on debentures, Indians, army navy, and traveling expenses of members of Congress.

As to Treasury notes, they have, we believe, been paid out only when acceptable to creditors, and are not only above the paper par almost every where, but in some places above specie, and often taken in preference to specie.—Globe.

From the Bangor Democrat.

The New York Sun, a neutral paper, states that in a late discussion, in Board of Aldermen of New York city, Alderman Benson made some startling disclosures, which show how that city has been plundered to sustain the federal cause there. Mr. Benson said he knew of one case in which work had been let out at \$12,000 which could be performed for \$1,000, and of a sewer which ought not to cost over \$30,000, which had been let on a contract for \$70,000. The Sun adds—

"We do not assert when we assert press purpose of control votes of are bought and partially exposed

VIRG.

The democratic quence of divis themselves.—T 2d inst. says the re net loss in d —the federal n 10 to 15. Th in the Senate stand 21 dem. ers say:—

Though we on joint ball Federal] Sen ted States—ye checkmate the [federalists] in pass to instruct can be carried States.—From Old Dominion who is dismay astroph? W allow for the c us. And if t next spring— may lose a Se that one or tw sequeres of offi spirals of office We tell the their victory. The Republ Philippi—and constances the paign. Few under more u rry is distresse bent laid at Our party has torn to piece with each oth many of them have fought a —among the Conservatives. pervaded im them, no orgi running again peation woul of the most Republican c has probably the polls in all minorities The day, too the party die the weather.

All that v Let this fu Washington. your dispute against ager ens dication Messrs Van er a genero ice? Away upon which even with eve is more th hands. It i national ap opinion upon ellate—cor Tell us not question, difficult str a compoun even wigh self is avow The leadin of our well We well re vention was basis, and prebension mition. C all be sett praved—t talked of that the breakers, to save the now.

For ou reastest w one we a with con will avoid will cheri hand wil saving the gravation ing with dispute i will unite remedy. the victo wrested, hands of The C says:—

"The Republic vote gi count In one for the votes. Tyler, posed o did not

"We do not speak in ignorance ourselves, when we assert that they are made for the express purpose of rewarding party favorites, who control votes of employees, and others, which are bought and sold by such means as are here partially exposed."

VIRGINIA ELECTION.

The democracy have lost Virginia in consequence of divisions and lukewarmness among themselves.—The Richmond Enquirer of the 2d inst. says that up to that time the democratic net loss in the Assembly was 21 members—the federal majority in that body will be from 10 to 15. There will be one democratic gain in the Senate, where parties will probably stand 21 dem. to 11 federalists. The Enquirer says:

Though we may not have strength enough, on joint ballot, to prevent the election of a [federalist] Senator to the Congress of the United States—yet the Senate is strong enough to checkmate the political manoeuvres of the [federalists] in the House. No resolution can pass to insinuate Mr. Roane out of his seat. None can be carried in favor of a Bank of the United States.—From this galling shame, at least, the Old Dominion will be safe. * * * But who is dismayed and downcast at such a catastrophe? We confidently say, not we. We allow for the chase which have operated upon us. And if we are wise, all will be well again next spring—with the exception only that we may lose a Senator of the United States—and that one or two worthy men may feel the consequences of the [federalist] aspirations for the spoils of office.

We tell the [federalists] to make the most of their victory. They will not enjoy it long. The Republicans will meet them again at Philadelphia—and under more advantageous circumstances than have attended the recent campaign. Few parties have ever gone into action under more unfortunate auspices. The country is distressed; and the sole blame of it has been laid at the door of the Administration. Our party has been never more distracted—torn to pieces in many counties—wrangling with each other—unwilling to co-operate—and many of them would not go to the polls. (We have fought a mid suspensions and shipmasters—among the disorders of Sub-Treasuries and Conservatives. An extraordinary apathy has pervaded many of our counties. In several of them, no organization—two or three candidates running against each other, as if such a competition would mend the matter—while in one of the most Republican counties, not even a Republican candidate was in the field! There has probably never been so thin a turn out at the polls in Virginia. The [federalists], like all minorities, are generally the most active. The day, too, was very bad; and the zeal of the party did not overcome the inclemency of the weather. * * *

All that we want is harmony and peace. Let this finance question be but settled at Washington. Again and again we say, "Settle your dispute in any amicable temper, and march together against the Money King, who threatens ruin to our country. Why should Messrs. Van Buren and Rives decline any longer a generous co-operation for the public service? Away with those subordinate questions upon which they have recently differed! Away with every feeling which has separated them in the slightest degree!—The party, and what is more their country, demands it at their hands. It is not too late to save us from a national bank, if we lay all our differences of opinion upon the altar of our country." Conciliate—compromise—unite and rally together. Tell us not that you cannot compromise this question. Has not our country been in more difficult straits than it is present—and has not a compromise always "smothered down the raven wing of discord?" The Constitution itself is avowedly founded on a spirit of compromise. The leading feature of the present Constitution of our own State is the spirit of compromise. We well remember the morning when the Convention was agitated by the white and the mixed basis, and many a heart was throbbing with apprehensions about the division of the Old Dominion. "Fear not, (said the patriarch,) it will all be settled. I remember the same feeling pervaded the Federal Convention. Many then talked of disunion; but as soon as it was seen that the ship was about to dash upon the breakers, every hand was piped upon deck to save her from the shipwreck. It will be so now. * * *

For ourselves, we have never gone into any contest with a more buoyant spirit, than in the one we are about to enter. We have done with complacency, if ever we made any. We will avoid crimination and recrimination. We will cherish harmony. We will unite heart and hand with every Democrat, who will assist in saving the Republic. We will forbear all aggravation; all offence; all wrangling and bickering with our political friends. We will not dispute about the causes of the disease. We will unite with all in making and applying the remedy. If this spirit be generally cultivated, the victory is ours; and Virginia will again be wrested, at the next spring election, out of the hands of the federalists.

The Globe, in speaking of the same subject, says:

"The consequence of the dissent in the Republican party, is seen in the meagre vote given. In some decided Republican counties, no candidate of the party appeared. In one county, the whole Federal vote given for the successful candidate, amounted to 38 votes. The whole vote for the Hon. John Tyler, who is returned from the district composed of York, James City, and Williamsburg, did not amount to two hundred votes. Such

an apathy in an election was never known before. It seems that the people, finding that the public men who have heretofore commanded their confidence, differed so widely among themselves, were determined to wait a fuller development of pending questions, before they would give a final opinion. What that opinion will be when the principles upon which the Administration acts are fully understood, no man can doubt who properly appreciates the purity, probity, and patriotism of the "Old Dominion."

We give place to these extracts for the purpose of showing that the result in the Old Dominion does not furnish the least cause for despondency on the part of the democracy. On the other hand, we have no doubt it will serve to unite and invigorate the party there, and thus lead to an ultimate and glorious triumph.

Virginia.—The Richmond Enquirer of the 3d inst. conceded too much to the federalists in a previous number. The democrats have gained two Senators; the Delegates elected, as far as ascertained, stand 67 federalists to 54 democrats. There are 13 counties to be heard from in which the result may be set down as doubtful. The Enquirer thinks we shall carry five, and that the chances are in our favor in two more. To tie the democrats in joint ballot, the federalists must carry six of the doubtful counties.

The Journal of Commerce states that Banks (dem.) is elected in Patten's District by 9 votes—the Commercial says Slaughter has succeeded.—Eastern Argus.

It will be seen, by reference to our Congressional Proceedings, that the Bill for appointing a Board of Commissioners of Claims, has passed the Senate and been sent to the House for concurrence and will probably meet a favorable action there. This is a capital affair. By its provisions the Board is to inquire into all claims which the accounting officers of Government are not empowered to adjust and allow. Instead of appealing to Congress for justice and taking the chances of getting it, those who have claims upon the Government will soon be able, through the board of Commissioners, to obtain it as full and as promptly as through any Court of Jurisdiction. Baogor Democrat.

THE VOICE OF JEFFERSON. Let Jeffersonian Democrats read the following testimony of the apostle of Democracy, in favor of a Divorce of Bank and State, and an Independent Treasury.—Age.

"We should make a beginning towards an independent use of our own money, towards holding our own bank in all the deposits where it is received, and letting the treasurer give his draft or note for payment at any particular place, which, in a well conducted Government, ought to have as much credit as any private draft, or bank note, or bill, and would give us the same facilities which we derive from the banks."

Since the arrest of Henderson, charged with passing a forged treasury note, it has been ascertained that the proof impressions, of which he became possessed, were obtained about the middle of January last, by the robbery of Mr. Rawdon, one of the engravers, whose trunk was broken open at the United States Hotel in Philadelphia, and rifled of part of its contents, among which were several proof impressions of Treasury notes. It is believed that, in addition to the notes passed on the Farmers' and Planters' Bank of Baltimore, but three others have been uttered, or exist, two of them of the denomination of one hundred dollars and one of fifty dollars. These notes being on India paper, can readily be detected.

Eastern Argus.

The Committee appointed for that purpose by the City authorities of Cincinnati have reported that there were 255 persons on board the Moselle, at the time of her explosion—of this number 58 are dead, 56 missing, 6 wounded, and 103 saved. Besides these several were known to be on board who were not registered.

Eastern Argus.

ANOTHER FATAL EXPLOSION.

We sicken at the frequency of steamboat disasters. They seem to pour in upon us this week in a manner calculated to shake the confidence of the timid, and even the stout hearted, in the safety of steam navigation. No danger need be apprehended from steamboats where the proper care is taken by the Captain not to create a greater quantity of steam than can be readily "let off." In almost every instance where these terrible explosions occur, the catastrophe is directly attributable to the culpable negligence, wicked recklessness or wanton imprudence of the commanders of these boats. And shall they be permitted to endanger the lives of hundreds with impunity, merely to gratify the fool-hardy ambition to test the swiftness of their boats?—Let the severity of their punishment be commensurate with the enormity of the offence.

Saco Dem.

The Louisville Journal gives the particulars of the explosion of the steamer Oronoko, Captain Crawford, which left New Orleans on Monday, April 16.

On Saturday morning the 21st, at about 5 o'clock, having made but two revolutions after leaving Princeton Miss., she burst one of her boilers, blowing overboard some 15 or 20 passengers, and severely scalding between 40 and 50 that remained on board. Some 6 or 7 of the latter died previous to the departure of the steamer. Among the scalded that were on board, as near as could be ascertained, there were between

20 and 30 white men, chiefly deck passengers, 5 or 6 women, and about the same number of children from the age of 1 to 4 years, that have since died. Among those that went overboard about 4 or 5 were saved. Some few cabin passengers were supposed to be missing. The 2d engineer was badly scalded. The 2d cook, (a black,) who was badly scalded, jumped overboard some time after the explosion and was drowned.

The number of cabin passengers on board the Oronoko at the time, as near as could be ascertained, was from 75 to 80; on deck, 60 to 70, including blacks and children. Most of the passengers in the cabin were in bed at the time of the accident, otherwise the loss of lives would have been immense.

Other accounts state that there were between 75 and 100 lives lost.

Another dreadful Steamboat Disaster. A serious disaster took place on board the packet Boat, yesterday morning, about six o'clock. The boat was preparing to leave our wharf, for Wheeling, in the performance of her regular trips, and the engine had made but two revolutions in backing out from the shore, when, by some cause, two of the flues collapsed, which did great injury to the boat and many persons on board. The clerk, Mr. Fulton, was badly scalded; we regret to learn his life is despaired of. Mr. O'Neal, employed on board had his skull fractured. Mr. Vanosell, a deck hand was thrown overboard, and was drowned; an individual, whose name we could not ascertain is missing.

The concussion was so powerful, that half of the upper works of the boat, together with dry goods, &c. on the deck, were completely destroyed, or scattered upon the wharf, and several individuals standing on the wharf were overthrown by the shock. So far as we are informed of the particulars of this accident, it is attributable to the carelessness of the officers, and particularly the engineer.

Where are our laws for the protection of life on steamboats.—Stubenville (Ohio) Union.

From the New York Commercial Advertiser.

THE CHARLESTON FIRE.

Slips from our correspondents of the Mercury and Courier, dated on Monday, gives us some further particulars of the recent sad calamity in that city.

The fire broke out about 9 o'clock on Friday evening, and was first discovered issuing from a small old frame building next to the corner of Beresford and King streets, occupied by colored persons as a fruit store; the buildings were wrapped in flames before the alarm became general.

Total number of dwellings and stores destroyed, including Norton's old rice mills, Kerr's wharf, set on fire by flakes falling on a pile of light wood and burnt to the ground, 560. The number of out buildings destroyed estimated at about 587—total number of buildings destroyed, 1,158.

Deaths by blowing up, Fred. Schrieber, John Pearl, Col. Steadman and Robert Munroe. Messrs Brown and Tarley, badly injured, several negroes killed.

Such is the mere arithmetic of this frightful calamity—who shall count the mental suffering, the loss of hope, of security, of comfort? Upon the best estimates which have been made to us, up to the latest hour, we set down the loss of property at over \$3,000,000. The whole amount covered by insurance, is not far from \$1,500,000. Of this \$750,000 falls upon the Georgia offices, at Augusta. The new Hotel was insured in this city for \$60,000, and \$40,000 in Augusta. It is believed now that the offices here will pay all, or very nearly all of their liabilities.

A meeting of the City Council of Charleston was held the day after the fire, at which sundry resolutions were adopted to aid the sufferers. The mayor had called for a detachment of militia, to patrol the city at night, to aid the guard in protection of property. Ten thousand dollars were placed at the disposal of the committee, to furnish provisions to the destitute. Another committee was formed to make arrangements for the reception of the sufferers into the orphan house, and to obtain other suitable places. The Medical College, in Queen street, had been offered to the Committee for any necessary purpose.

BANKS IN AUGUSTA. It gives us unfeigned pleasure to state that the Banks of this town have taken an early and decided stand on the subject of resumption. Immediately upon ascertaining that the New York Banks had resumed, they took up the subject in earnest. Some of them have resumed, formally, by resolution, and we are credibly informed that all of them will pay specie for all their liabilities. This is worthy of our Banks—none are stronger, under better direction, or more entitled to the public confidence.—Age.

Congressional Proceedings.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, April 30, 1838.

Mr Fairfield said he had moved an adjournment with the intention of addressing the House upon this subject to-morrow, but the adjournment was refused, and he would study to be content. Considering, however, the attitude in which he stood, in reference to this question, he could not permit the vote to be taken, late as it was, and fatigued as the members were, without saying a word or two.

By the resolution of the 28th of February, a select committee was instructed to investigate a certain transaction, and to inquire whether any breach of the privileges of this House had been committed. It passed by a vote of almost

unexampled unanimity. This branch of the resolution, however, is now proposed, by the motion, as modified, of the gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. Adams,) to be rescinded.

We are now, said Mr. F., called upon to tread back—to acknowledge ourselves in an error—to abandon an important part of the original inquiry; and to start upon a new track. Wherefore? What were the reasons for such a course? What new light had broken in upon the minds of gentlemen? For one, said Mr. F., I have been anxiously listening to hear some new and convincing reasons to justify this turning this short corner, to palliate this seeming inconsistency; but I have listened in vain. Perhaps there is something in this matter more than meets the eye or ear. The resolution of inquiry was adopted by a vote of 152 to 49, or thereabouts, and now, many of those who composed this large majority, seem anxious to rescind the resolution as they were on the 28th of February to adopt it. Has a voice come from the public, since that time, condemnatory of our course, and are gentlemen endeavoring to make amends for running counter to the wishes and interests of the people? On the contrary, I had thought, said Mr. F., that the evidence upon that point was directly the other way. Some fifteen or twenty thousand of the people have sent in their memorials approving our course, and bidding us God-speed. Indeed, most of them demanding the strictest investigation at our hands. But all this, and the indications of public opinion as manifested through the public prints, seem now to amount to nothing in the minds of some gentlemen: reason far superior and paramount to these and all former considerations exist from abandoning a course so unitedly and honorably commenced. But what are they? Will some gentleman be good enough to inform us? As yet we are in the dark.

It has been insinuated by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Jenifer] that the movement was a political one. Sir, said Mr. F., was the vote of 152 to 49 a political vote? There can be no pretence for saying that. If, then, the question has become political, let me inquire how, and by whose agency? If it was not political to vote for a resolution, it surely cannot be regarded as political to adhere to it. One side of this House are now where they were on the 18th of February, entertaining the same sentiments of the subject of inquiry, and adhering still to the then highly favored resolution. If any party has abandoned it, or any portion of it, and are now more desirous to baffle than to prosecute the inquiry; they best know why: so far all is left to conjecture. The reasons offered for recommending the report, do not go to justify the rescinding of this branch of the resolution. The committee, on a re-examination can as well inquire whether there has been a breach of privileges committed, as if their report and resolutions had excited no dissatisfaction whatever. The recommitment of part, and the rescinding of another part, have no necessary connection. Why, then, should the latter be proposed? If this matter is to be got rid of, perhaps it is thought that a side blow will best effect that object. It is to be hoped, however, that neither the motion to recommit or rescind will prevail, but that the case will proceed, and the House be brought to a direct vote on the resolutions reported by the committee.

MARRIED.

In this town, on Sabbath evening last, by Rev. C. B. Davis, Mr. Silas P. Jones to Miss Melinda Hathaway.

ADMINISTRATOR'S SALE.

BY virtue of a License from the Probate Court for the County of Oxford, there will be sold at public Vendue on Saturday the 16th day of June next, at one o'clock P. M. on the premises, Thirty acres of Land in Albany in said county, be the same more or less, belonging to the estate of Samuel Pingree late of said Albany; Terms, credit with satisfactory security on interest till the first of January next.

TIMOTHY HUTCHINSON, Adm'r.

Albany, May 11, 1838.

Notice.

THE undersigned hereby gives notice that he was duly qualified as Surrogate of the County of Oxford on the fifth day of May instant.

HENRY W. MILLETT.

Norway, May 7th, 1838.

Sheriff's Sale.

OXFORD, ss.—Taken on Execution and will be sold at public Auction, at the Inn of Capt. John Harris of Bethel in said County, on Saturday the first day of June next, at one o'clock in the afternoon—All the right in equity which Leeson Mason of said Bethel, Blacksmith, has of redeeming all that real estate situated in said Bethel on which he now lives, the same being mortgaged to one Samuel Chipman formerly of said Bethel and now of Gorham in the County of Coos and State of New Hampshire, Blacksmith. Further particulars and terms of sale will be given at the time and place of sale.

AARON CROSS, Deft. Sh'ff.

Bethel, April 29, 1838.

STATE OF MAINE.

In SENATE, March 8, 1838.

The joint standing Committee on the Judiciary to whom was referred the Petition of Warren Clark, praying that the Bonds of Matrimony may be dissolved, because after having lived in the married state four years, they find their tempers and dispositions so utterly incompatible that the matrimonial chain has become exceedingly galling—have had the same under consideration and ask leave to submit the following

REPORT.

As petitioners of this kind have become somewhat frequent, and as unfortunately, as your committee believe, for the character of the State they have, in some two or three instances, been successful; the petition now under consideration would seem to furnish a fit occasion to examine as to the power of the Legislature, in such cases, to entertain jurisdiction and grant relief; so that if it could be found on examination, that it cannot rightfully exercise such power, its time in future, may not be consumed in investigating

the facts in such cases, and people may become satisfied that the Legislature is not the proper tribunal, to which application for relief is to be made.

Marriage is not considered as a mere contract liable to be continued or dissolved at the pleasure of the parties, and as having only the incidents of an ordinary contract; but it is treated and considered as more, as a civil institution, more interesting and important, in its nature and consequences, than any other known to society; inasmuch as it involves the sound morals, the domestic affections, and all the tender and endearing relations and duties of parents and children. "And it may be truly said that Christianity, by giving to it a more affecting and sublime morality, has conferred on mankind new blessings, and has elevated woman to the rank and dignity of an equal, instead of being a humble companion and a devoted slave." Our laws in relation to divorces are made in reference to considerations of public policy, and not to the mere contract of the parties; and therefore they are not permitted to make the marriage contract dissoluble by any private agreement made at or after the marriage. The question then arises to what tribunal does it belong to dissolve the marriage contract—a contract, as described, far transcending, in its importance, and effects on society, all other contracts? Is the exercise of such a power, in its nature, Judicial or Legislative? Your committee are constrained to believe it is essentially judicial.—Our Constitution declares, "that the powers of this Government shall be divided into three distinct departments the Legislative, the Executive, and the Judicial; that the Legislative shall have full power to make and establish all reasonable laws and regulations for the defence and benefit of the people of this State, not repugnant to this constitution, nor that of the United States." It also provides that "the Judicial power of this State shall be vested in a Supreme Judicial Court, and such other Courts as the Legislature shall, from time to time establish; and that every person, for an injury done in his person; reputation, property or immunities, shall have remedy by course of law." From these provisions in our constitution it would seem to follow, that it is the appropriate business of the Legislature to make laws for the benefit of the people; and the legitimate province of the Judges to interpret, expound, and apply them. If the Legislature undertakes to dissolve a marriage contract, it either conforms to its decision to the existing laws in relation to divorces; or it disregards these laws, and in effect, makes a new law unknown to all the world before, and then proceeds to apply it to the particular case. If it conforms its decisions to existing laws, it then exercises concurrent authority with our Courts; and if it can properly exercise concurrent authority in this all important class of cases, why may it not extend its jurisdiction and power to all other cases? and thus our Legislators, becoming our Judges, would be brought, in the language of some of the petitions to this Legislature, "within the roach of the people," and that annually too.—And Judges of this character, it will be perceived, would not be subject to be impeached or removed on address—an inconvenience to which the Judges known to our Constitution are very properly subjected. But if, in such cases, the Legislature, in effect, makes a new law unknown before, fitted to each particular case as it is presented, and applies it to such case, it must be conceded by all, it violates that provision of the Constitution, which gives every person for an injury done, "a remedy in due course of law." Besides, law in order to be constitutional cannot look to the past or the present, but to the future, otherwise they violate the very definition of a law, which is a "rule of civil conduct." They must also be passed according to certain forms and be promulgated; neither of which is done in the case supposed. They must also apply to the whole community, and not to particular individuals; otherwise there would be a violation of the equality of rights and privileges guaranteed by the Constitution to all our citizens. The Legislature is not then a branch of the Judiciary as known to our Constitution, nor is it a court in the last resort, having the right, in divorce cases, to prescribe and apply to each particular case, such principles as suits its pleasure—acting, above and beyond all law. There are many other considerations and views connected with this question, which might be suggested and presented; but sufficient has been said, as your Committee believe, to establish the position, that the Legislature cannot in any case, nor under any circumstances rightfully undertake to dissolve the marriage contract.

Your Committee, therefore, submit the following Resolutions:

T. BOUTELLE, Chairman.

Resolved respecting the dissolution of the marriage contract.

Resolved, That, to dissolve the marriage contract, is the proper exercise of Judicial power acting according to the known laws of the State; and that the Legislature cannot rightfully exercise such power—and therefore that the Petitioners in this case have leave to withdraw.

In SENATE, March 8, 1838.

This report was read and accepted and the Resolved passed and

Ordered, That the Secretary of State be directed to publish the Report and Resolves in the volume of the Resolves and also to publish the same in all the papers that print the Laws of the State.

N. S. LITTLEFIELD, President.

House of Representatives,

March 9, 1838.

Read and concurred.

E. H. ALLEN, Speaker.

Paris, February 5th, 1838.

dominating growth is of a mixture of various hard wood

WILLIAM F. WILLIAMS,
Madrid March 6, 1839.

is, April 3, 1838.

JOE WOREX,
EATLY EXECUTED AT THIS
OFFICE.

cepted. The
with great ex
to load his rif
larnied his w